UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| 10/528,033 | 03/16/2005 | Nicolas Berthou | 4590-381 | 2704 |
| | 7590 07/10/2007 FMAN & BERNER, LLP | | EXAMINER | |
| 1700 DIAGONAL ROAD, SUITE 300 | | | YACOB, SISAY | |
| ALEXANDRIA | A, VA 22314 | | ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 2612 | |
| | | | | |
| | | • | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| · | | | 07/10/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| /4 | | | • | 31 |
|---|---|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| | | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | | 10/528,033 | BERTHOU ET AL. | |
| Č | Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| | | Sisay Yacob | 2612 | |
| Th Period for Re | e MAILING DATE of this communication app ply | ears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address | |
| WHICHEN - Extensions after SIX (6) - If NO period - Failure to re Any reply re | ENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY /ER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we ply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, beceived by the Office later than three months after the mailing ent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION B6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirn rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE | N. nely filed the mailing date of this communicat D (35 U.S.C. § 133). | |
| Status | | | | |
| 2a)⊠ This 3)⊡ Sind | ponsive to communication(s) filed on <u>14 Mar</u> s action is FINAL . 2b) This be this application is in condition for allowant accordance with the practice under <i>E</i> | action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pro | | is |
| Disposition o | of Claims | | | |
| 4a) 0 5) | m(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are pending in the application. Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw m(s) is/are allowed. m(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are rejected. m(s) is/are objected to. m(s) are subject to restriction and/or | | | |
| Application P | apers | | • | |
| 10)∐ The Appl Repl | specification is objected to by the Examiner drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accession and not request that any objection to the cacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex | epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj | e 37 CFR 1.85(a). lected to. See 37 CFR 1.121 | (d). |
| Priority unde | r 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | |
| a) | Certified copies of the priority documents Certified copies of the priority documents | s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | on No ed in this National Stage | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | |
| 1) Notice of R 2) Notice of D 3) Information | eferences Cited (PTO-892) raftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08))/Mail Date | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other: | ite | |

Art Unit: 2612

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

1 This communication is in response to applicant's amendment to a first non-final office action, which was filed May 14 2007.

Arguments to pending rejected claims 1-11 and newly introduced claims 12 and 134 have been entered and made of record in the application of Berthou et al., "Sealed keyboard" filed on March 16, 2005.

Claims 1-11 are same as previously presented.

New claims 12 and 13 are introduced.

Claims 1-13 are pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments to the rejected claims are insufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited prior art to overcome the rejection of said claims under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as discussed below. Applicant's arguments with respected to the pending rejected claims 1-11 and new claims 12 and 13, filed on May 14 2007, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for at least the following.

Art Unit: 2612

4 On page 4 and all subsequent applicant's argument with respect to claim 1, as to the Ootani et al., failing to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the claimed limitations.

Page 3

- Ootani et al., discloses a sealing means with flexible membrane (Item 6), the rigid key (Item 41), the flexible membrane 6 is attached both to the front face 5 and to the rigid key 41 advantageously by bonding (i.e. the sealing means is engaged into 41 tightly and pressed to 5 tightly so that the space inside is shielded air-tight from the outside environment; Col. 3, lines 44-56).
- As to applicant's argument that "the flange 62 is pressed to the panel is due to the combination of the wedge 43 and the step 52 that retain the slider 4."
- 7 Combining multiple components into one to replace by an equivalent one piece is not patentable.
- As to applicant's argument that "another advantage of avoiding wedge 43 and step 52 is that the noise of the contact between wedge and step is avoided when the slider moves up. In this movement, the slider is only retained by the flexible membrane that is not noisy where it moves."

Application/Control Number: 10/528,033 Page 4

Art Unit: 2612

Ootani et al., discloses the noise of the contact between wedge and step is avoided when the slider moves up, wherein, the slider is only retained by the flexible membrane that is not noisy where it moves (Col. 2, lines 35-52).

- As to applicant's "respect to claim 2, although Ootani discloses with respect to the Fig. 7 embodiment that the cup rubber 6 can be adhered to the upper surface of the panel, this only applies to the Fig. 7 embodiment."
- Ootani et al., disclosure of Fig. 7 embodiment is disclosed as an alternative embodiment, so if it can be used and/or done in one in one embodiment, it can also, be used and/or applied to the other embodiments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) The invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- Claims 1-5, 7, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent of Ootani et al. (5,821,482).

Art Unit: 2612

- As to claim 1, Ootani et al., discloses a keyboard (Col. 1, lines 6-10) comprising a switch (Item 71 of figures 5A-B and 6A-B), a rigid key (Items 41 of figures 4A-B, 5A-B and 6A-B), allowing an operator to operate the switch (Col. 4, lines 51-64), a front face having an opening traversed by the rigid key (Item 5 of figures 4A-B, 5A-B and 6A-B), and sealing means preventing particles from penetrating between the rigid key and the opening (Item 6 of figures 4A-B, 5A-B and 6A-B), wherein the sealing means comprise a flexible membrane traversed by the rigid key, attached to the key and to the front face (Col. 3, line 45- Col. 4, line 6).
- As to claim 2, Ootani et al., discloses wherein the flexible membrane is attached to the rigid key and to the front face by bonding (Col. 3, lines 44-65; Col. 6, lines 1-13).
- As to claims 3 and 7, Ootani et al., discloses wherein it comprises means of limiting the travel of the rigid key relative to the front face (Item 51 of figures 4A-B, 5A-B and 6A-B).
- As to claim 4, Ootani et al., discloses wherein the limitation means comprise a shoulder of the rigid key, and in that the shoulder is capable of butting against the front face when the operator presses on the rigid key (Items 44 and 61 of figures 4A-B, 5A-B and 6A-B).

Application/Control Number: 10/528,033 Page 6

Art Unit: 2612

As to claim 5, Ootani et al., discloses wherein the flexible membrane is attached to the rigid key on the shoulder (See figures 4A-B, 5A-B and 6A-B).

- 19 As to claim 12, Ootani et al., discloses wherein the flexible membrane is cup shaped (Item 6 of figure 3).
- As to claim 13, Ootani et al., discloses a keyboard (Col. 1, lines 6-10) comprising a switch (Item 71 of figures 5A-B and 6A-B), a rigid key (Items 41 of figures 4A-B, 5A-B and 6A-B) allowing an operator to operate the switch (Col. 4, lines 51-64), a front face having an opening traversed by the rigid key (Item 5 of figures 4A-B, 5A-B and 6A-B), and a flexible membrane (Item 6 of figures 4A-B, 5A-B and 6A-B) traversed by the rigid key (Item 42 of figures 4A-B, 5A-B and 6A-B), attached to the key and to the front face to prevent particles from penetrating between the rigid key and the opening (Col. 3, lines 44-56).

Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2612 -

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- Claims 6 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent of Ootani et al., (5,821,482) in view of US Patent of Dugas et al., (5,612,692).
- As to claims 6, and 8-11, Ootani et al., does not expressly disclose wherein it comprises means of lighting the rigid key via the inside of the keyboard, and in that the rigid key is transparent.

Dugas et al., discloses a sealed keyboard that comprises means of lighting the key via the inside of the keyboard, and in that the key is transparent (Col. 2, lines 23-40; Col. 4, lines 55-61; Col. 6, lines 15-31; Items 16, 44 and 48 of figure 4).

It would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to modify the keyboard of Ootani et al., by incorporating the means of lighting the key via the inside of the keyboard, as disclosed by Dugas et al., in order to have a keyboard wherein it comprises means of lighting the rigid key via the inside of the keyboard, and in that the rigid key is transparent, because Dugas et al., discloses a

sealed keyboard that may be removed and cleaned that is shielded from any foreign elements and provide a tactile feedback of key actuation to the user by key illumination.

Page 8

Conclusion

- 25 **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
- A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.
- Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sisay Yacob whose telephone number is (571) 272-8562. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00 AM 4:30 PM.

Art Unit: 2612

Page 9

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffery A. Hofsass can be reached on (571) 272-2981. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

29 Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Sisay Yacob

6/29/2007

5-Y.

JEFFERY HOFSASS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600